

(A) a statement of the interests affected by the limitation that the President seeks to suspend; and

(B) a discussion of the manner in which the limitation affects the interests.

(b) **APPLICABILITY OF WAIVER TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—If the President exercises the authority set forth in subsection (a) in a fiscal year, the limitation set forth in section 3(b) shall apply to funds appropriated in the following fiscal year for the purpose set forth in such section 3(b) except to the extent that the limitation is suspended in such following fiscal year by reason of the exercise of the authority in subsection (a).

#### SEC. 8. DEFINITION.

As used in this Act, the term "United States Embassy" means the offices of the United States diplomatic mission and the residence of the United States chief of mission.

### NOTICE OF HEARING

#### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs will hold a hearing on S. 1341, the Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995, a bill to transfer certain lands to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the city of Scottsdale, AZ. The hearing will take place on Thursday, October 26, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

Those wishing additional information should contact the Committee on Indian Affairs at 224-2251.

### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, on September 20, the Senate passed the Agriculture appropriations bill. I would like to take this time to explain some of the votes I cast during debate on this bill.

I voted for several amendments related to reducing the scope of the Market Promotion Program including an amendment which would reduce funding for the MPP's and limit potential users to small U.S. businesses.

While many businesses have benefited from this program, in these times of extreme budgetary austerity, we must prioritize Federal Government spending. These are tough choices, but if we don't make them now, the results will be devastating for future generations.

One of our goals in this Congress has been to free citizens from unnecessary burdens and excessive taxation of bureaucracy. In doing so, some Government programs which support businesses also must be reduced. It is my hope, however, that in the long run, we will allow individuals and businesses to keep more of the money they are now paying in taxes so that they are able to create programs like the Market Promotion Program without Government involvement.

I also voted against an amendment which would have eliminated from the bill a provision to provide assistance to cotton farmers whose crops were devastated by tobacco bud worms, beet army worms, and other pests. This amendment was accepted without my support.

Many farmers were told that the newly created Catastrophic Crop Disaster Insurance Program would provide the same level of protection as previous Federal disaster programs. These farmers, therefore, relied on the new program for help in disasters such as this. Unfortunately, the level of protection is not the same as previous disaster programs. The provision to assist cotton farmers was included in the bill because the Catastrophic Crop Disaster Insurance Program is not sufficient to help these farmers.

Mr. President, recognizing the extreme losses these farmers are experiencing through no fault of their own and over which they had absolutely no control, I feel it is appropriate that the Federal Government, assuming that the Secretary of Agriculture deems the losses disastrous, step in to provide these low interest loans to cotton growers who have been economically devastated by this disaster. •

#### DRUNK DRIVING PREVENTION ACT

• Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am joining Senator DORGAN in introducing the Drunk Driving Prevention Act of 1995. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this important piece of legislation.

The Drunk Driving Prevention Act of 1995 would require States to take a commonsense approach to preventing drunk driving accidents and deaths. The legislation would require the transfer of certain Federal highway funds to a State's highway safety program if a State fails to prohibit open containers of alcoholic beverages and consumption of alcoholic beverages in the passenger's area of motor vehicles. Sanctions under the bill would not go into effect until fiscal year 2000, so States will have ample time to comply with this law.

I have always been a strong supporter of efforts to eliminate the needless slaughter of innocent men, women, and children on our Nation's highways. I sponsored the legislation that established the 21 minimum drinking age law. That legislation has been credited with saving some 9,000 lives and 120,600 injuries over the last 10 years.

Even with efforts like the "21" bill, the killing continues. Last year, nearly 17,000 people were needlessly killed in alcohol-related traffic accidents. That amounts to one alcohol-related death every 30 minutes. The repercussions of impaired driving continue to cost our society some \$46 billion each year in direct costs, with approximately \$5.5 billion allotted for medical care.

Mr. President, we all know that mixing alcohol and driving is a deadly

combination. Unfortunately, 26 States in this country allow the consumption of alcohol in motor vehicles. This is an open invitation to disaster and an outrage that must be stopped.

I commend my friend from North Dakota for his tenacity on this issue and I am proud to join him in his effort to make our Nation's roads safer. •

### RETIREMENT OF SENATOR SAM NUNN

• Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to reflect upon the recent announcement of our esteemed colleague from Georgia that he will not seek reelection at the conclusion of his current term. I must of course, accept his decision, but I am also personally saddened by it.

SAM NUNN has given much to this body, and given even more to the people of Georgia. Early in his career, SAM NUNN quietly impressed his colleagues with his thoughtful and well-reasoned speeches on the future of our national defense. And as the former chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, he helped shape that future with strong leadership and keen intellect.

SAM NUNN let one of this body's most important committees during a time of enormous, it not tumultuous, global change. His foresight about events in the Russian Republic led this body to create one of the world's most important mechanisms for ensuring the peaceful disposal of former Soviet weapons. To this day, the Nunn-Lugar initiative on security assistance leaves a legacy of peace in the post-cold-war era—a peace that stands as a fitting tribute to the efforts of its author.

But SAM NUNN's commitment to peace has been matched, if not surpassed, by his commitment to a strong defense. For nearly a decade, SAM NUNN has helped crystallize the standards by which we examine our national defense. It was SAM NUNN who pushed for the American research initiatives that have resulted in today's stealth technologies. Likewise, it was SAM NUNN who ensured those technologies were available to those serving in our Armed Forces, giving them the edge they needed to defend our country.

Finally, it should be noted that SAM NUNN always put first the needs and the safety of America's service personnel. Over the past 23 years, SAM NUNN has consistently fought for our service members and their families. Whether it was funds for better housing, or expanded opportunities for better medical care, SAM NUNN has always been there guarding the interests of our dedicated troops. The dozens upon dozens of tokens of appreciation that adorn his office wall are proof of SAM NUNN's commitment to people.

SAM NUNN is a gentleman and a scholar. He has graced these halls for more than two decades with his quick wit, commitment to public service, and personal passion for the affairs of our

Nation. I wish my friend well, and I shall miss his service in this body.●

#### DECLINING CARIBOU HERD/ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, later this week, the Senate will be voting on amendments to the budget reconciliation bill, which the Senate Budget Committee approved today. One of those amendments will be to strike the provision that opens up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling.

I strongly oppose drilling in ANWR and will support that amendment. If we allow drilling in the coastal plain, we are destroying what the Fish and Wildlife Service calls the biological heart of the only complete Arctic ecosystem protected in North America. We will be destroying that resource for a one in five chance of finding any economically recoverable oil in the coastal plain. And, even worse, we will destroy that biological heart in an effort to recover what many experts suggest will be only 200 days worth of oil for the Nation.

Mr. President, I do not intend to argue all the issues surrounding the decision to drill in ANWR, or to keep it as it is. Instead, I want to only focus on one issue: caribou.

On Saturday, the Anchorage Daily News reported that a new State survey produced by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game revealed a sharp decline in the central Arctic caribou herd, which calves and ranges in the Prudhoe Bay and Kuparuk oil fields, from 23,400 animals in 1992 to about 18,100 this summer. The census also revealed that the herd that stays away from the oil and gas development has not suffered as much decline.

The State and Federal wildlife biologists do not know what caused the decline, but one thing is sure. The article paraphrases a State wildlife biologist.

[A]lmost all of the decline has occurred in that part of the herd that ranges near the oil fields. It could be due to noise, traffic or some other disruption of caribou grazing, or to some natural cycle.

Mr. President, I raise this because there has been some dispute involving the effects of the proposed drilling on wildlife, and particularly on caribou. Supporters of drilling in ANWR contend that caribou are flourishing and the caribou may even benefit from development. Opponents of drilling contend that the impact will negatively affect caribou, particularly the porcupine caribou, which calve on the 1002 area and on which the Gwich'in people depend for their food and culture.

Two herds occupy ANWR: the porcupine herd and the central Arctic herd. There are significant differences between the two herds, but, according to industry, the basic features of the ecology are similar. Industry publications boast that the central Arctic herd caribou are healthy and increasing in the Prudhoe Bay region, and that oil devel-

opment has not adversely affected caribou. Opponents of drilling believe otherwise.

Reasonable people can and do differ on this point. However, this recent study raises some serious questions as to the health of the central Arctic herd. More importantly, the fact that the herd is declining on those lands where there is current oil and gas development, raises critical questions about the effects of proposed oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Environmentalists have contended that the effects will be severe to the caribou herd. This survey suggests that they may be right. The Anchorage Daily News article cites recent research by a University of Alaska Fairbanks biologist, which found that caribou living near the oil fields have far fewer calves.

And, a Federal Arctic National Wildlife Refuge biologist is paraphrased as saying:

If oil activity is to blame, such impacts would be magnified in the wildlife refuge. There, the porcupine herd is much larger—about 150,000 animals—but there is less coastal habitat and the calving grounds are much smaller.

Mr. President, when the Senate votes on the fate of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, every Member should put politics aside and vote on facts. This report is serious. We ought not take a chance on the pristine ecosystem and its wildlife by drilling in ANWR.

I ask that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Anchorage Daily News, Oct. 21, 1995]

#### OIL FIELD CARIBOU DECLINE—STATE FINDS FEWER IN ARCTIC HERD (By Steve Rinehart)

A new state caribou survey has found a sharp decline in the Central Arctic caribou herd, which ranges in and around the Prudhoe Bay oil fields.

State and federal biologists said they don't know what caused the decline but said it could have been brought on by interference from the oil fields, or by some unknown natural cause. In any case, the caribou count released late Friday by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game may strengthen arguments against opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge just east of Prudhoe to oil drilling.

The effect of oil development on caribou is one of the core issues in the statewide and national debate over drilling in ANWR. There, the much larger Porcupine caribou herd calves in areas that are thought to be hot oil prospects.

The Central Arctic herd has dropped from about 23,400 animals in 1992, the most recent prior survey, to about 18,100 this summer, according to the count released late Friday. Low calf production brought on by undernourished cows is thought to be the cause of that 23 percent decline, but the reasons behind it are not known, according to state Fish and Game biologist Ken Whitten of Fairbanks, who conducted the survey.

However, Whitten said, almost all of the decline has occurred in that part of the herd that ranges near the oil fields. It could be due to noise, traffic or some other disruption of caribou grazing, or to some natural cycle, he said.

The department's first accurate count, coinciding with the early days of oil produc-

tion in 1978, placed the herd at about 6,000 animals. The herd more than doubled in the next five years, then climbed steadily to its peak.

The most recent survey was scheduled to be conducted in 1994, but was delayed until this year by bad weather. In a memo dated Friday, Whitten said the census was based on "high quality" aerial photographs taken July 15.

"Weather conditions and caribou behavior were ideal for the photo-census effort," Whitten wrote. "It is unlikely that many caribou were missed."

The kind of change noticed in the Central herd is not extraordinary for caribou, Whitten said in an interview. "The fact that it is happening around the oil field is what is drawing attention," Whitten said.

Biologists for the major oil producers could not be reached for comment Friday evening. However, at a wildlife conference in Fairbanks this summer, before the census was completed, British Petroleum scientist Chris Herlugson said his observations indicate the Central Arctic caribou may benefit from some oil field improvements.

Thousands of caribou "come right into the fields on sunny, calm days when the mosquitoes and flies are abundant," he said at the time. "Those gravel roads and pads will provide a little bit of relief."

Arco spokesman Ronnie Chappell said his company would "delay comment until we have had an opportunity to talk to the biologists who conducted the census."

Fran Mauer, a federal Arctic National Wildlife Refuge biologist who has worked with state Fish and Game on caribou studies, said he was not surprised by the findings. Recent research by a University of Alaska Fairbanks biologist found that caribou living near the oil fields have far fewer calves, he said.

"There are a myriad of potential factors," he said, but one part of the census stands out: The part of the Central Arctic herd that keeps away from Prudhoe has not suffered near as much decline.

If oil activity is to blame, he said, such impacts would be magnified in the wildlife refuge. There, the Porcupine herd is much larger—about 150,000 animals—but there is less coastal habitat and the calving grounds are much smaller, he said.

The census got plenty of attention late Friday. For, although the biological significance of the new caribou count is uncertain, the political weight may be considerable.

In lobbying to open ANWR to drilling, the Knowles administration, the oil industry and development groups have made much of the fact that the Central herd has grown dramatically during the 20-year history of Prudhoe Bay. Oil exploration "will not hurt the wildlife or the land," declared an advertisement in a Washington, D.C., newspaper this week, placed by the state- and industry-funded group Arctic Power.

The new census does not contradict that, said Arctic Power director Debbie Reinwand.

"We could still say that the number of caribou have tripled since Prudhoe Bay," she said. "I think if (oil development) was going to hurt the caribou we would have seen it in that 20-year period."

She said she did not think the new information would sway Congress, which is days away from voting on a major budget bill that includes the ANWR drilling provision.

ANWR drilling opponents, though, said the census supports their arguments, and could affect the debate.

"It makes an opening for people to listen who were not inclined to listen before," said Bob Childers of the Gwich'in Steering Committee, which represents some Interior Alaska Natives who oppose drilling.